FOR MYSORE STATE

Agriculture (195 /) Department.

SERIES.

G.O. NO. 637
639

Dated 11th September 1957
11th September 195-

[Despatch Abstract.]

1. Daily rate of pay for women to remove it — Allowance to agreement for payment of wages in kind to the labourers employed in weeding in horticultural farms — Orders issued. [illegible]

The South Kanara & Coorg Areca Growers' Union

MANGALORE.

Kadri, Mangalore-3.

Ref No. S.46.

10th July 19 5

49479

ASSISTANT SECRETARY
13 JUL 1951
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

To

The Secretary,
Food Department,
Government of Madras,
Madras.

Sir,

Sub:- Levy scheme in South Kanara- Union-representation.

The Executive Committee of our Union has authorised a committee consisting of Sri. M.N. Bhide, Sri. G.K.Govinda Bhat and Sri. A.P.Subbaya, besides the Secretary, to represent to the Madras Government the difficulties caused by the present levy scheme. So, I request you to fix up an appointment for the purpose of meeting the above representatives at an early date and oblige.

A

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,
For The South Kanara & Coorg Areca Growers' Union,
A.P. Bhat.
Hon. Secretary.

Submit for orders ~~to~~ to the request as at A above.

16/7/51

16/7/51

17/7/51

S

Food & Agriculture (B)

(Blue ink)
pl. issue

Letter No. 4943/S. A/51-1 D/19-7-51.

5/19/7/51 Dkd 19/7/51

To
The Hon. Secretary,
The South Kanara & Coorg Areca Growers' Union,
Kadri, Mangalore-3

Sir,

Sub: Procurement - Foodgrains - Levy Scheme in S. Kanara Dt. - Representation by the S. Kanara & Coorg Areca Growers' Union - Date and time for interview - Fixed.

Ref: Your letter No. S.46, D/10-7-51.

I am to invite a reference to your letter cited and to say that the ~~proposed~~ deputation, referred to ~~in your letter~~ therein, may meet the Food Secretary in his room at the Secretariat

Tpsdly file 1c

pages above

Fd on page 1

at 12-00 noon on the 25th instant.

18/7/51

18/7/51

18/7/51

Action to be taken as per instructions in the engagement book

18/7/51

Order of Commissioner to be noted in the engagement book

18/7/51

2-7-51

51995

0974

INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT.

B. Class / Prefix — Code — No.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY 25 JUL 1951 FOOD AND AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT 25 JUL 1951 FOOD AND AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Recd. at ____ H. ____ M. Sent ____ H. ____ M. Office Stamp

MADRAS 24 JUL 5

From ____ To ____

By ____ By ____

Office of Origin.	Date.	Service Instructions.	Words.

TO

0 OT MERCARAHILL MANGALORE 24 28

SECRETARY FOOD DEPARTMENT FORT ST GEORGE MADRAS =

RECEIVED YESTERDAY COMMNICATION DATED 19 TH JULY

ETING 25 TH NOT POSSIBLE REQUEST APPOINTMENT 1 ST

K AUGUST = SECRETARY ARECA GROWERS UNION = +

N.B.-The name of the Sender, if telegraphed, Should be written after, but separated from the text.

Sri Vidhya Press, Madras-12—Bks. 45,000—51.

Food & Agriculture (A)

Letter No. 49479-A/57-2 D/26-7-57.

Issue today
Dr d
28/7/57
26/7/57

To

The Secretary, The S. Kanara & Coorg
Areca Growers' Union,
Kadri, Mangalore-3

Sir,

Sub: Procurement - Levy System
of procurement - S. Kanara DC. — Representation
by the South Kanara & Areca Growers' Union -
Revised date and time for interview - Intimated.

Ref: Your Telegram D/24.7.57

W.r.t. Your telegram cited, I am (directed)
to inform you that the deputation may make
it convenient to meet the Food Secretary
in his room at the Secretariat at 12:00 noon

P.T.O

The South Kanara & Coorg Areca Growers' Union

MANGALORE

ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ಕನ್ನಡ ಮತ್ತು ಕೊಡಗು
ಅಡಿಕೆ ಬೇಸಾಯಗಾರರ ಸಂಘ,
ಮಂಗಳೂರು.

Hadri, Mangalore- 3,

Ref No. [illegible] Dated 6th August, 1951

SECRETARIAT GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
8 AUG 1951
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

ASSISTANT SECRETARY
8 AUG 1951
55640
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Sri R.M.Sundaram, I.C.S.,
Secretary to Government,
Food and Agricultural Department,
Government of Madras,
Fort St. George, Madras.

Dear Sir,

Ref:- Your letter No. 49479-A/51-2 dated 26th July, 1951.

Sub:- Procurement- Levy system of procurement- South Kanara district.

.....

~~That~~ A deputation of the Areca Growers' Union will be meeting you on the 11th instant at 12 noon. A copy of the Memorandum is sent herewith in advance. The points raised therein will be clarified and explained at the time of the meeting.

Yours faithfully,

President.

To

The Secretary,
Food and Agriculture Department,
Government of Madras,
Fort St. George, Madras.

From:

Sri M.N.Bhide,
President,
The South Kanara & Coorg Areca
Growers' Union,
Kadri Road, Mangalore.

Sir,

Subject:- Procurement of Foodgrains-
Levy Scheme - South Kanara district-
Allowance to Areca growers.

This Union invites your kind attention to the following and while considering the same to take into account the clarifications that would be made by our representatives who have been asked to meet you on the 11th of August in this connection. This Union while requesting for the reconsideration of the entire Levy Scheme in so far as the entire district is concerned makes special mention of the areca growers, who have the necessary produce of their own for the cultivation of their areca gardens and their domestic consumption.

SOUTH KANARA DISTRICT IS NOT SELF-SUFFICIENT BUT DEFICIT

South Kanara has been wrongly classed as a self-sufficient district, and the inclusion of " South Kanara District " in schedule II of the Levy Order is a consequence of this wrong classification. In 1931 during the Re-settlement period this district was claimed to be self-sufficient Even this is doubtful. The population at that

time was 13,66,939 whereas it is now nearly 18 lakhs. This shows an increase of 33 percent. If there had been any corresponding increase in the extent of cultivation or volume of production in foodgrains there would have been some basis to presume that the district is self-sufficient. But, the fact that both the extent of cultivation of food crops and the volume of production have decreased has been brought to the notice of the Government many times and despite this, to say that South Kanara is self-sufficient is most unreasonable, in addition to doing a great wrong on false presumptions. The undisputed fact is that during the years 1944 to 1950 when Intensive Procurement and Rural Rationing were in force not less than 10,000 tons of rice were being imported into the district annually in addition to wheat and such other products and even then the Government could not meet their rationing commitments ! Now when there is no control over individual consumption it is quite apparent that the deficit would be still greater. And now, simply to claim and assert and then to act on this assumption that South Kanara is self-sufficient is a patent wrong and injustice. To introduce Levy Scheme which is worse than the previous Intensive Procurement Scheme seems to us as persisting in doing and enforcing such a wrong, and, it is our duty therefore to bring this matter to the notice of the Government.

The Government should therefore reconsider this matter immediately and delete the name of the district from the II schedule of the Levy Order,

and treat this district as a deficit district and make such arrangements as would become necessary as a consequence of such a change. We respectfully urge that this has to be done immediately.

HARDSHIPS UNDER THE LEVY SCHEME.

In the practical working of the Levy System, in such places as it has been worked, the fact that tenants and landlords who would have no surplus to deliver have now been asked to deliver large quantities under the present scheme, is enough to prove that it is worse than the Intensive Procurement Scheme. If, before fixing the scale of levy the Government had adopted the common course of consulting the representatives of the people, instead of blindly sanctioning the unrealistic and impractical proposals made by the officials who themselves are mostly unaware of material facts and circumstances, such hardships would not have resulted. The Government of India have empowered State Governments to procure only the SURPLUS. Even the Levy Order says that the SURPLUS should be sold. In your reply to our representation you have said " ... only a portion of the surplus grains with the producers would be procured .... ". But, inspite of all these noble and holy intentions, the Levy Scheme in actual working reveals the hardships which have proved much worse than those encountered during the worst days of the Intensive Procurement. It is our effort to bring such matters to the notice of the Government in so far as the areca gardeners are concerned, and to seek redress of these grievances.

The fixing of a uniform scale for all classes of wet land in this district betrays the gross and colossal ignorance under which the authorities are labouring. To give a concrete instance. The I class wet lands in these districts yield two or even three crops. The II class wet lands yield only one crop. The III class wet lands yield such crops as are just sufficient for their cultivation expenses if conditions prove favourable. To adopt a uniform average for all these different and varying yields is wrong and unjust. Even in the case of the wet lands which are I class the scale of Levy is out of all proportion to the actual yield, leaving " real surplus" out of question. Where formerly there would have been no surplus to deliver in the case of a ryot cultivating as owner or tenant 5 acres of wet land, under the present Levy Scheme he will be obliged to give 9 measures of rice in respect of each crop, or, this, in short is the effect of the Levy Scheme in these districts.

In this district paddy cultivation is done mostly by leasing the lands to tenants. According to the present system, it is expected that the landlord should get his rent in kind for his own domestic and other requirements. But, in fact, there will be no surplus left at all with the tenants after the legitimate requirements of the tenant and the landlord are satisfied, in a majority of cases. Apart from this, when there is no rural of other kind of rationing, wherefrom the non-producers and the partial producers to get foodstuffs for themselves? We believe the Government has not been appraised of such difficulties, or otherwise,

2. The requirements of the family of the cultivator and the legitimate needs of the landlord to be taken into account, and only the remaining surplus to be procured.

3. Areca Gardeners to be allowed to retain rice at the rate of 7 murae of rice per acre per year for areca garden labour

4. Similar allowances to be made in connection with the maintenance of temples or religious or charitable institutions.

5. The landlord alone to be required to deliver surplus, and not tenant. Exceptions could be made in such cases where the landlords desire that the tenant may be dealt with directly. Necessary measures to be take n to ensure proper delivery of real surplus.

6. Delivery to be taken from the house of the tenderer on cash payment. If this is impossible, within half a mile of his dwelling at the most. Price to be paid on delivery at spot.

The intention of this method of modifying the Levy is to tide over the present crisis. In the above manner it is our estimate tha t the needs of the statutory rationed a reas, the population of which is about 2 lakhs could be satisfied without too much harassment and oppression to the countryside This might promote the grow-more-food efforts and help in the restoration of normal conditions, at least within a few years. We like to make absolutel clear that if the original proposals as embodied in G.O.Ms.No. 1048 dated 18-5-1951 are enforced the position in this district will become entirely uncomfort able for everyone, and, what is more,

the production of food crops which have received a fillip since the removal of Intensive Procurement would get such a severe set-back and reaction that it would be useless to think of any progress by way of increased food production in the near future.

Yours faithfully,

President.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY
11 AUG 1951
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

1 JUL 1951
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

56601

The Secretary,
Food and Agriculture Department,
Government of Madras,
Fort St. George, Madras.

From:

Sri M.N.Bhide,
President,
The South Kanara & Coorg Areca
Growers' Union,
Kadri Road, Mangalore.

Sir,

Subject:- Procurement of Foodgrains-
Levy Scheme- South Kanara district-
Allowance to Areca growers.

This Union invites your kind attention to the following and while considering the same to take into account the clarifications that would be made by our representatives who have been asked to meet you on the 11th of August in this connection. This Union while requesting for the reconsideration of the entire Levy Scheme in so far as the entire district is concerned, makes special mention of the areca growers, who have the necessary produce of their own for the cultivation of their areca gardens and their domestic consumption.

SOUTH KANARA DISTRICT IS NOT SELF-SUFFICIENT BUT DEFICIT

South Kanara has been wrongly classed as a self-sufficient district, and the inclusion of " South Kanara District " in schedule II of the Levy Order is a consequence of this wrong classification. In 1931 during the Re-settlement period this district was claimed to be self-sufficient. Even this is doubtful. The population at that

and treat this district as a deficit district and make such arrangements as would become necessary as a consequence of such a change. We respectfully urge that this has to be done immediately.

HARDSHIP UNDER THE LEVY SCHEME.

In the practical working of the Levy System, in such places as it has been worked, the fact that tenants and landlords who would have no surplus to deliver have now been asked to deliver large quantities under the present scheme, is enough to prove that it is worse than the Intensive Procurement Scheme. If, before fixing the scale of levy, the Government had adopted the common course of consulting the representatives of the people, instead of blindly sanctioning the unrealistic and impractical proposals made by the officials, who themselves are mostly unaware of material facts and circumstances, such hardships would not have resulted. The Government of India have empowered State Governments to procure only the SURPLUS. Even the Levy Order says that the SURPLUS should be sold. In your reply to our representation you have said " ... only a portion of the surplus grains with the producers would be procured .... ". But, inspite of all these noble and holy intentions, the Levy Scheme in actual working reveals the hardships which have proved much worse than those encountered during the worst days of the Intensive Procurement. It is our effort to bring such matters to the notice of the Government in so far as the areca gardeners are concerned, and to seek redress of these grievences.

we believe, the right and proper thing would have been done by now.

ARECA GROWERS WHO HAVE THEIR OWN PRODUCE FOR THEIR CULTIVATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION.

Areca growers even during the operation of the Intensive Procurement Scheme were able to convince the Government of the necessity to make due allowance for payment of wages in kind to areca garden labour. Accordingly, in Government Memorandums Nos 21161-A/ 46-6 Food dated 10-12-1946 and 45516-A/ Food dated 6-11-1948 and Bp. RT 87/50 dated 18-1-1950 orders were passed permitting areca gardeners to retain out of the produce of their lands, whether homefarm or let out to tenants, rice or paddy computed at 7 muras of rice per acre of areca garden. It is unnecessary to repeat the very arguments in favour of making such allowance. We request you to peruse the Government Memorandums cited above and also our Memorandums presented in that connection.

What is now being sought through this Memorandum is a simple matter of granting the very same facilities which the Government were pleased to grant in worse circumstances. It is our conviction that since as it is claimed by the Government that it is their clear intention to make the position much easier now than when Intentive Procurement was in force, it will not be at all difficult to achieve this by directing the district authorities to make these allowances while preparing levy notices.

Though we have clearly set forth the case of the entire district and claimed treatment as that

of a deficit district in the interests of the general public including all the green gardeners who do not have their own produce, we beg to remind the Government that the case of gardeners who have their own produce is based on their fundamental rights to utilise such produce for their legitimate requirements, and, which right should be beyond dispute or even attack.

Our representatives who will be meeting the Secretary for Food and Agriculture will make suitable clarifications of the points raised in this Memorandum. We like to add that that the following scale and mode of levy might be considered in case the Government find the imperative need of retaining this district among the Self-sufficient districts despite realities.

SCALE OF LEVY.

1. III class wet lands to be exempted outright.

2. 4 acres of II class wet lands to be treated as equal to 2 acres of I class wet.

3. With the above consideration, up to 3 acres NO LEVY.

4. " " " 3 to 5 acres 1 mura of rice per acre per year.

5. " " " 5 to 10 acres 2 muras of rice per acre per year.

6. " " " Above 10 acres 3 muras of rice per acre per year.

MODE OF LEVY.

1. Individual tenants or even landlords who have their cultivation in one unit should be treated as a seperate unit and the above scale to be applied.

2. The requirements of the family of the cultivator and the legitimate needs of the landlord to be taken into account, and only the remaining surplus to be procured.

3. Areca Gardeners to be allowed to retain rice at the rate of 7 muras of rice per acre per year for areca garden labour.

4. Similar allowances to be made in connection with the maintenance of temples or religious or charitable institutions.

5. The landlord alone to be required to deliver surplus, and not tenant. Exceptions could be made in such cases where the landlords desire that the tenant may be dealt with directly. Necessary measures to be taken to ensure proper delivery of real surplus.

6. Delivery to be taken from the house of the tenderer on cash payment. If this is impossible, within half a mile of his dwelling at the most. Price to be paid on delivery at spot.

The intention of this method of modifying the Levy is to tide over the present crisis. In the above manner it is our estimate that the needs of the statutory rationed areas, the population of which is about 2 lakhs, could be satisfied without too much harassment and oppression to the countryside. This might promote the grow-more-food efforts and help in the restoration of normal conditions, at least within a few years. We like to make absolutely clear that if the original proposals as embodied in G.O.Ms.No. 1048 dated 18-5-1951 are enforced the position in this district will become entirely uncomfortable for everyone, and, what is more,

the production of food crops which have received a fillip since the removal of Intensive Procurement would get such a severe set-back and reaction that it would be useless tothink of any progress by way of increased food production in the near future.

Yours faithfully,

President. 11/8/57.

mp/narasa 11.8.57

27 Food & Agriculture

Items. No. 49479-A/57-3 dt 4-9-57

Subj :- C.S.- Paddy and rice - levy procurement - S. Kanara dt. -

Allotment to areca growers for payment of wages in kind to the labour employed in areca gardens - Representation - Orders passed - Instructions issued.

Ref :- From the South Kanara and Coorg Areca Growers union, Mangalore letters, dt 15/7/57 and 6/8/57.

The South Kanara and Coorg Areca Growers' union, Mangalore, has been making repeated representations to the Govt., for the grant of a concession to the areca growers similar to that granted to them when intensive procurement scheme was in force in S. Kanara dt., under which areca growers were issue ready paddy/also permitted to retain out of their procurement quantities adequate quantities of paddy required for payment of wages in kind to the labourers employed in areca gardens at a prescribed rate and scale. It has been urged by the Assn that the scale of levy fixed for the dt. is by no means easy, that the grain kept with the growers after satisfying the levy demand determined on the basis of the present scale is quite inadequate to meet their require-

(P.T.O)

requirements and their consequently the areca growers are put to much difficulty for want of adequate grain to pay the labour employed in their areca gardens in kind in accordance with the long existing custom. The Govt. considers that there is some justification in their representation and have decided to revise the concession granted to the areca growers under the incentive procurement scheme. They accordingly direct that each areca grower may be permitted to retain out of his produce of his lands, whether rented or not or to tenants, the quantity of rice required for payment of wages in kind to the labour employed in areca gardens at the rate of 2 labourers per acre for 10 months in a year at the scale of 16 ozs per adult per day, besides the quantity needed for his own household requirements and from which only the remaining surplus stocks be procured from him. The Govt. also direct that in case the quantity so remaining with him and available for procurement is less than the very demand due according to the scale fixed, the demand may be suitably reduced by the Collector to cover the quantity actually available for procurement in exercise of the powers provided to the Collector

Foodgrains Levy Procurement
Order 1957.

Memo. of Dev. (cs)
is requested to issue necessary
instructions to the Collector of
S. Canara with reg. to the above
orders.

C/29.8.57.

JA
Memo. of Dev
to Collector (cs)
S. Canara
Mc. 2

29/8/57.

29/8/57

29/8/57

Sub :- Civil Supplies - Rice - Procurement and rationing - S. Kanara Dt. - Representation thereon from the South Kanara & Coorg Areca growers union for a meeting.

Ref :- From the Secretary, South Kanara and Coorg Areca growers Union Mangalore, Letter Dt. 10/7/61.

Please see the letter on the file.

A committee consisting of three persons deputed by the S. Kanara and Coorg Areca Growers' Union is meeting the Secretary, F & A Dept on the 25th July at 12 Noon to represent to the Govt. the difficulties caused by the Levy Scheme of procurement.

In this connection it is submitted that several representations have already been made to the Govt. both through petitions and during discussions at the recent meeting of the State Food Advisory Committee, on the working of the Levy Scheme in some of the districts where it is now in force. These representations have already been examined by the Govt. and some decisions have been taken on them. The position in this regard is explained below briefly

(1) One of the representations made is that except in the case of Natural dr., the levy of Procurement Order does not apply to second crop paddy raised in a fasli, in the districts of S. Arcot, S. Kanara, ~~Madurai~~ & Tiruchirapalli & Sirkazi taluk dt. as no specific provision is made in the Order for this purpose and that in view of this, procurement from second crop in these dts. would be illegal. The Govt. hold the view that it is the intention to apply the levy Procurement Order to second crop, paddy also and also third crop, if any, raised in a fasli, and that this intention has been made clear in the Order itself. ~~Because the head~~ The heading adopted in respect of ~~the~~ several groups in the Scale of levy fixed in respect of these dts. is "Extent of paddy cultivation" and this heading makes it clear that the levy demand has to be fixed and delivered every time paddy is cultivated on a piece of land - whether as first crop, or second crop or third crop. So it is proposed to issue a Press Communique to clarify this fact.

Point (2) :- The Andhra point represented is that the present method of calculation of levy demand on second and third crops as a progressively higher rate Scale (work

much hardship to the producer as he has to deliver more from these crops than from the first crop. The Govt considered that there was some force in this argument as in view of the fact that the yield from the second & third crops will be less than from the first crop. Instructions have therefore been issued that the levy demand in respect of the first and second crops should be calculated adopting the same rate of levy as for the first crop and taking into account the previous cultivation on the farm. (b) - It was suggested that a provision should be made in the Levy Procurement Order providing for an appeal against the levy demand fixed by the first instance. The Govt have agreed to this and it is proposed to amend the Order for the purpose of providing for an appeal against the levy demand fixed in the first instance to the next higher authorities to be filed within one week from the date of service of demand notice.

(c) - Another representation is that the producer must be permitted to sell the surplus over and above them after satisfying the levy demand at any price in the open market.

(P.T.O)

The producers in the levy procurement
order do not are even now allowed to sell
their surplus stocks, after meeting
the levy demand, in the open
markets but subject to price
control. ~~The Govt. consider that~~
the producers
they cannot be permitted to sell
their stock at any price, because
such a step would make procurement
impossible, and further at the prices
will go very high beyond the purchasing
power of lower classes of non-producers.
Point (5) :- A complaint particularly
received from the T. Kanara dt., is
that the scale of levy adopted for the
dt. is too heavy, and that therefore the
levy scheme works more hardship
to the producers than the intensive
procurement scheme, as too much
the grain is left over with him
after meeting the levy demand
is not adequate to meet even
bonafide requirements. In his
report, which was specifically
called for on this point, the Collector
of T. Kanara has stated that the
scale adopted for the dt. is by
no means excessive. The Collector
has however admitted that in the
case of producers owning more than
5 acres and having large families,
the scale of levy may cause be excessive,
as the stocks left over after meeting
the levy demand may not be adequate
to meet the domestic and agricultural
requirements. The Collector has stated

that in such cases the quantum be procured is limited to the demand as under the intensive procurement scheme. The Collector has also stated that he is examining the question of the revision of (has promised) levy demand and that ~~a report~~ to submit a further report which is awaited.

Point (6) :- Another point represented is that levy demand notices are in respect of second crop and served on producers in the S. Canara very late when the producers had no surplus stocks to deliver and thus the smaller producers were being harassed thus. This point was also stressed by Sri Hegde in the State Food Advisory committee meeting. With reg. to this, Secretary has ordered that the Collector should enquire into these complaints and exempt smaller producers from levy wherever necessary in order to avoid harassment.

Point (7) :- Another point raised by Sri Hegde in the discussions on the levy meeting of the S.F.A.C. is that it is not justifiable to make both the landlord and tenant responsible for surrender of levy demand, and suggested that only the tenant should be held responsible for surrender of the levy demand. With reg. to this it is submitted that only such of the land lords who

receive a share of the produce as rent in kind are made responsible for surrender of levy demand. In such cases it is not fair to hold the tenants alone responsible to surrender levy demand.

Point (8) :- Both GI has been represented that producers in S. Canara have required to go over long distances to deliver their surplus stocks for procurement as there are no collection depots in the village centres. It is proposed to authorise the Collector to arrange for opening of more procurement depots in villages for collection of grain so that producers are not put to inconvenience.

file in O/C

With this information, the file may be circulated is submitted to Secretary for his use at the meeting on 25th

23/7/57

24/7/57

S to telephone for tea

25/7/57

D

Please can we meet me on Saturday 11th July at 12 noon

25/7

A.S.

w.r.t. Secy's orders above a draft letter is submitted for approval.

25/7/57.

24/7/57.

25/7/57.

D sup 6 above. Item A deputation
from the South Kanara District Areca growers' Union will be meeting
Secretary, Food & Agri. at 12 Noon
on 11-8-51. The union has
sent in advance copy of the
memorandum containing the
suggestion proposed to be
made by them.

These suggestions are
examined in the Sectional Note
below. The main previous
note at pt. 1 above about
the representations so far made
to the Govt. in regard to the working
of the levy procurement scheme
may also be perused.

2
10/8/51

WD
10/8/51

S

DS
10/8/51

Re deputation, I met the
I have explained items I & II
which really are matters
affecting not only Areca growers
but all the cultivators
& people.

Item III Re Cauvery Fishery
in 1946 will be found in
Re Levy procurement can be
modified accordingly
11/8/51

14/8

2

Note for Circulation.

The file deals with the request of the South Kanara & Coorg Areca Growers' Union that the areca growers, who are also paddy producers, may be permitted to retain out of the produce of their lands, adequate quantity of paddy required for payment of wages in kind to the labour employed in areca gardens, before surrendering the demand under levy procurement scheme.

Under the Intensive Procurement Scheme, producers are allowed to retain the necessary grain required for cultivation expenses, i.e., payment of wages to agricultural labour in kind besides other bona fide requirements, and only the remaining surplus with the producers will be procured. This allowance for cultivation expenses is generally given in respect of food crops only and not commercial crops. But, when the intensive procurement scheme was in force in the South Kanara District the Government, after repeated representations from the S. Kanara & Coorg Areca Growers' Union, had allowed a special concession to the areca Growers, permitting them to retain out of the produce of their lands, a fixed quantity of paddy for payment of wages in ~~terms~~ kind to the labour employed in areca gardens, besides other allowances for seed requirements, domestic consumption etc. The Government had also ordered that the quantity to be allowed in this regard should be fixed at the rate of 2 labourers per acre of areca garden, for 10 months in a year on the scale usually allowed in the locality for farm servants. As there were no regular farm servants employed in the district, the Collector of South Kanara allowed the grain at the scale of 16 ozs. per adult per day for 2 labourers per acre for a period of 10 months in a year, excluding 2 months in rainy season. This scale

I South Kanara Dt is a deficit dt. Therefore classification of the dt as a self-sufficient dt under the Revised Food Policy is wrong and introduction of levy & procurement in the dt is unjustifiable. Hence, the district should be classified as deficit and levy & procurement given up.

Note

This is not a new representation. Similar representations have been made several times before ever since the dt had been classified as self-sufficient under the Revised Food Policy. There is also a Lr II starred question given notice of for answer in the Assembly asking for particulars on this question.

Lr II The file is linked below.

S. Kanara dt has been classified as a self-sufficient dt primarily for the reason that per Lr II according to the estimates of production of rice in the dt, the district has a normal per capita production of 358 lbs of rice. The per capita production of rice this year is 332 lbs which means that the district produces enough rice to supply of more than just about 1 lb. per adult per day.

These figs are according to the present population

(1971)

Various complaints received about this classification, Smt (Dr) [illegible] has specifically requested in Qn (5) in Lr II

(P.T.O)

check and verify these figures, and then report to Govt whether the figures are correct. Mr. Sen is out of station (S) in the II.

It is also true that the dt. was being given regular import assistance in the previous years. Though it was not original intended to give any import assistance to the dt. this year, it is true some import assistance was being given to the dt. in view of the fact that procurement of rice was not satisfactory and in view of the several strong representations made by the collector. So far 10,100 tons of rice (X) have been allotted to the dt. Thus in view of this import assistance, the food and value need not be attached classification of the dt., as all sufficiency does not carry much significance with it now.

(X) May - 3000
June - 2000
July - 3000
Aug - 2100
10,100

As regards the suggestion to give up any procurement, this may not be accepted, as the dt. is one of the process quite a substantial quantity of rice* a portion of which can be procured for controlled distribution in the dt. as otherwise the dt. will have to be given large imports.

*9.

The dt. was no doubt given import assistance in previous years (exceptions year.) as the figs in the margin on the next page will indicate. Post with a paragraph

10/8/51

11 Suggestion :-

The levy scheme of B or M.U-15 procurement was introduced in the Sikanara dist., works more hardship to the producer than the previous ~~incentive~~ levy procurement scheme, because the grain is kept with the producer after the levy demand delivered ~~fixed~~ according to the scale fixed is surrendered, is not adequate to meet his requirements. Further, the ~~fixation~~ fixing of an uniform scale of levy for all classes of wet lands is unjust, because there are generally 3 classes of wet lands, and the yield of one type of land widely varies from that of the other type, and the present scale fixed is excessive even for the first class land. The scale suggested or ~~fixed~~ to by us should be adopted. The land lord alone should be required to deliver levy demand and not the tenant. ~~For~~ In cases, where the land derives, the tenant may be dealt with directly, ~~or~~ there will be no surplus left ~~with~~ with the tenant after the legitimate requirements of the tenant and the land lord are satisfied in majority of the cases.

Note :- This also is not a new suggestion. With reg to ~~the~~ ~~letter already made by the~~ ~~for the Collector was~~ an allegation already made above in Pt I.

(P.T.O)

Place
The scale fixed is for each cuss. for T class wet land with bore & pay levy three times while in 3 cuss in class III wet land pay only one levy

the harshness of the levy procurement scheme, a report was called for from the Collector. The Collector has reported that even the present scales are not excessive, and does not work any hardship except in the case of smaller growers having only 5 acres and under and also a large family. The Collector has reported that in such cases the levy demand is limited to the demand as under the interzonal procurement scheme, i.e., actual surplus after allowing for the homeside requirements. The Collector has however reported that he has since submitted proposals for revision of scales of levy which are being examined by the Board. The Board's remarks are awaited on these proposals.

As regards collection of levy demand only from the land lord it is submitted that under the provisions of the Levy Procurement Order, both the land lord, who receives portion of the produce as rent in kind, and the tenant are made responsible for surrender of levy demand. This is reasonable, as it is not otherwise possible to collect the levy demand if we leave either person free. The demand will also be apportioned between the two with reg. to the portion of the produce received by each. No action is called for on this suggestion.

9/8/57 w.r.t the complaints referred

Ex. II-16 of file I

Ex. 15 of file I

Ex. 27 of file I

Clause 3(1) & 1·2 of X

from some other quarters that the demand notices in respect of procurement from Anggi-Crop were served on the producers very late in the month of June by which time there was no surplus with the smaller producers to satisfy the levy demand, we have issued instructions to the Collector of S. Kanara to revise this direction and waive the collection of the levy demand from the poorer ryots, the stocks left with whom do not exceed their bonafide requirements. As regards the complaint about harassment by petty officials, we have asked the Collector to take suitable action. It is seen from the latest report of the Collector that the procurement officers were instructed to allow the bonafide requirements of the cultivators & landlords & procure only the surplus with them even if should be below the quantity found in the demand notice.

The Collector appears to have sent proposals already to the Govt regarding revision of the rate of levy to be adopted in the S.K. Dt for the next crop in consultation with some of the prominent landholders of the Dt, according to which the levy procurement is likely to be very easy so as to leave with the producers sufficiently large quantities for their requirements. The proposals in this regard are awaited from the Govt.

The Deputations may be told that the question of revising the

10/8/51

(P T O)

pp 19-21 C/F/L-FI

do

p 27 C/F/L-FI

para 1, p 27 C/F/L-FI

do

scale of levy is under consideration so as to make it a really easy one & allow for the legitimate requirements of the producer. They may also be told that the scale of levy is fixed at a flat rate, the special requirements of a body of cultivators, like the Malea farmers, cannot be taken into account and the scale revised in their favour as such a step is bound to create discontent in the dt.

WD
07/07

III Suggestion :

When the intensive procurement scheme was in force (Govt. Memo. No. 15-16 Food, dt. 5-1-1944) the area gardeners who were also mostly growers were allowed to retain the grain required for payment of wages in kind to the labourers employed in area gardens, as in the case of the agricultural labourers, at the rate of 1 measure of rice per acre of area garden reported and surrender for procurement only the remaining surplus. The similar concession should be given to them even under the levy procurement and only the actual surplus kept with them after making the allowing necessary grain for the above purpose should be procured.

Note :

It is a fact that the concession referred to was allowed to the area gardeners under the intensive procurement scheme vide Govt. Memo. Nos. M.S.J. 69 (C) 21161-A/46-6, Food, dt. 10.11.44 and M.S.J. 69 (H) 4655-16-A/48-1 Food, dt. 6.11.44.

(* This rate of 1 measure of rice per acre for ten months in a year and at the rate usually allowed in the locality for farm servants)

This concession was also withdrawn vide M.S.J. 69-24 (C) as it was being abused by them and the procurement was suffering.

This union had already made a similar representation (K) to the Govt. for the

(P.T.O.

grant of this concession under levy procurement scheme, and the ~~Association~~ Union was informed that this question does not arise as only a portion of the surplus which the producer is expected to be procured under the levy scheme. p.69/g ante (k)

The Union now requests that the area gardeners may be permitted to retain out of the produce of their lands ~~for~~ one or the value of) rupees per acre of areca garden for your ~~for long year of~~ besides their requirements, such as domestic consumption seed requirements etc., and only the remaining quantity procured. If this means that the scale of levy will have to be suitably reduced in their case wherever necessary in such cases where the quantity left over is not less than the demand fixed as per scale notified. Note on p.4 (h)

~~It is for consideration whether this may be agreed to.~~

It is however pointed out that in the previous ~~year~~ occasion, when the concession was given, the allowance was ~~calculated~~ at the rate of 1 Cubanam per acre of areca garden for ten months in a year and not on the scale of 16 ozs. per labourer per day as laid down in the Government report at p.46 of (K).

It is for consideration whether similar concession may be given here.

Or see my note at p.4 (h)

10/8/51

above. The levy scale cannot be varied with ref. to the circumstances of different classes of cultivators. Arecanut fetches high prices in the market & the cultivators can afford to pay the labour in cash instead of in kind. In any case a diff. scale for areca is bound to create discontent. The departmentals may be informed that for these reasons the suggestion cannot be accepted.

WS
(10/8/57)

para 6 - [illegible]

Instructions have been issued & the collr. is having steps taken to open more collecting centres.

WS
10/8/57